

# **EXHIBIT I**

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)  
**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
601 California Street, Suite 1505  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
acera@saverilawfirm.com  
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)  
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)  
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)  
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER  
& SPRENGEL LLP**  
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 782-4880  
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com  
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com  
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

### *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*

V.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

*Defendant.*

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER'S  
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT  
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET  
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the  
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody  
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for  
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff  
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will  
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,  
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1]), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement  
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff  
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request  
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,  
 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”’);  
 2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request  
 3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.  
 4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.  
 6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any  
 10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the  
 17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated  
 22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

1 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 2 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 3 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

5 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 6 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU  
 7 are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due  
 8 to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

9 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:**

10 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 11 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 12 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 13 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 14 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to  
 15 the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as  
 16 vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the  
 17 facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7,  
 18 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit  
 19 “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL  
 20 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the  
 21 context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946  
 22 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12.  
 23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

25 Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical  
 26 bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due  
 27 to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
 2 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
 3 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
 601 California Street, Suite 1505  
 San Francisco, California 94108  
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
 acera@saverilawfirm.com  
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

10 *Counsel for Individual and Representative  
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

11 [Additional counsel on signature page]

13                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 14                   **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 15                   **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

16 Richard Kadrey, et al.,  
 17                   *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*  
 18                   v.  
 19                   Meta Platforms, Inc.,  
 20                   *Defendant.*

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER'S  
 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO  
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S  
 SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR  
 ADMISSION**

## **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:**

## **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**

## **RESPONDING PARTIES:**

## **Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder**

**SET NUMBER:**

## Two (2)

Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

## **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff's attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

1 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder. Plaintiff objects to this Request  
 2 as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 3 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 4 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 5 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 6 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 7 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 8 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 9 Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 10 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 11 Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained  
 12 by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

13 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

14 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 15 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 16 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the  
 17 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder. Plaintiff objects to this Request  
 18 as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 19 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 20 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 21 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 22 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 23 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 24 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 25 Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 26 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 27 Plaintiff responds, admit.

28 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

1 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
2 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
3 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
601 California Street, Suite 1505  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
acera@saverilawfirm.com  
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

10 *Counsel for Individual and Representative  
11 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

12 [Additional counsel on signature page]

13 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
14 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)  
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)  
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)  
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER  
& SPRENGEL LLP**  
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 782-4880  
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com  
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com  
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

16 Richard Kadrey, et al.,

17 *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*

18 v.

19 Meta Platforms, Inc.,

20 *Defendant.*

21 Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

22 **PLAINTIFF MATTHEW KLAM'S  
23 AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT  
24 META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET  
25 OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the  
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody  
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for  
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff  
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will  
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,  
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1]), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement  
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff  
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request  
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,  
 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”’);  
 2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request  
 3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.  
 4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.  
 6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any  
 10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also  
 16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the  
 17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated  
 22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also  
 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

1 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 2 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 3 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

5 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 6 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU  
 7 are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due  
 8 to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

9 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:**

10 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 11 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 12 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 13 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also  
 14 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to  
 15 the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as  
 16 vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the  
 17 facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7,  
 18 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit  
 19 “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL  
 20 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the  
 21 context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946  
 22 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12.  
 23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

25 Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical  
 26 bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due  
 27 to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)  
**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
601 California Street, Suite 1505  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
acera@saverilawfirm.com  
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)  
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)  
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)  
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER  
& SPRENGEL LLP**  
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 782-4880  
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com  
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com  
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

### *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*

V.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

*Defendant.*

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF MATTHEW KLAM'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO  
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S  
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR  
ADMISSION**

**PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.

**RESPONDING PARTIES:** Plaintiff Matthew Klam

**SET NUMBER:** Two (2)

Plaintiff Matthew Klam (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

## **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff's attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

## **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Matthew Klam. Plaintiff objects to this Request as

1 irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 2 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 3 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 4 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 5 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 6 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 7 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 8 Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 9 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 10 Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained  
 11 by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

12 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

13 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 14 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 15 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the  
 16 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Matthew Klam. Plaintiff objects to this Request as  
 17 irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 18 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 19 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 20 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 21 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 22 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 23 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 24 Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 25 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 26 Plaintiff responds, admit.

27 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

28 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
2 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
3 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
601 California Street, Suite 1505  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
acera@saverilawfirm.com  
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

10 *Counsel for Individual and Representative  
11 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

12 [Additional counsel on signature page]

13 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
14 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)  
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)  
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)  
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER  
& SPRENGEL LLP**  
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 782-4880  
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com  
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com  
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19 Richard Kadrey, et al.,

20 *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*

21 v.

22 Meta Platforms, Inc.,

23 *Defendant.*

24 Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
25 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

26 **PLAINTIFF JACQUELINE WOODSON'S  
27 AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT  
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET  
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the  
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody  
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for  
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff  
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will  
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,  
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1]), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement  
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff  
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request  
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,  
 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”’);  
 2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request  
 3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.  
 4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.  
 6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any  
 10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the  
 17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated  
 22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

1 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as  
 2 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 3 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

5 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have  
 6 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU  
 7 are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due  
 8 to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

9 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:**

10 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 11 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 12 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,  
 13 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also  
 14 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to  
 15 the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as  
 16 vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the  
 17 facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7,  
 18 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit  
 19 “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL  
 20 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the  
 21 context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946  
 22 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12.  
 23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

25 Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical  
 26 bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due  
 27 to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)  
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)  
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)  
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)  
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)  
**JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
601 California Street, Suite 1505  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com  
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com  
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com  
acera@saverilawfirm.com  
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  
Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)  
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)  
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)  
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER  
& SPRENGEL LLP**  
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 782-4880  
Email: [bclobes@caffertyclobes.com](mailto:bclobes@caffertyclobes.com)  
[asweatman@caffertyclobes.com](mailto:asweatman@caffertyclobes.com)  
[mrathur@caffertyclobes.com](mailto:mrathur@caffertyclobes.com)

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

### *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,*

V.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

*Defendant.*

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC  
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF JACQUELINE WOODSON'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO  
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S  
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR  
ADMISSION**

## **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:**

## **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**

## **RESPONDING PARTIES:**

## **Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson**

**SET NUMBER:**

Two (2)

Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

## **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff's attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

1 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson. Plaintiff objects to this Request  
 2 as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 3 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 4 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 5 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 6 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 7 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 8 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 9 Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 10 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 11 Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained  
 12 by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

13 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

14 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for  
 15 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it  
 16 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the  
 17 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson. Plaintiff objects to this Request  
 18 as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff  
 19 objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
 20 *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to  
 21 admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within  
 22 requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at \*3 (D. Del. Nov. 17,  
 23 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use  
 24 of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for  
 25 Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to  
 26 compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,  
 27 Plaintiff responds, admit.

28 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**